



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in political affairs, before its abolition could legally be effected. But it is impossible to believe that the Senate undertook such a stupendous task as the investigation of the conditions existing in each organization. Had it done so, we should have much information in ancient writers on a matter of so great importance. A third explanation, offered by Cohn, is that the word *collegium* means a legal club, formed for religious purposes, and that the *collegia* abolished at this time were those that had previously received authorization. But this also becomes impossible in view of the fact that no authorization was required for any of them. On the whole, it seems best to adopt the broadest definition of the word, and to hold with Waltzing that the associations suppressed by the Senate all bore the name of *collegia*, that many of them were old, that all were animated by factional tendencies, that they had many different forms, but that it was not intended to include the *collegia* of the priests or of the *Capitolini*, or certain associations of artisans. This definition of the word covers *sodalitates* and the political clubs, which masqueraded under the more dignified title of *collegia*, although the Romans would not normally expect to give that name to these temporary organizations. This is the conclusion reached also by Liebenam.

The senatorial decree was probably obeyed for four or five years; at any rate nothing is said about the associations, either favorable or unfavorable, until the year 59. In this year Piso was elected consul for 58, and granted permission for the celebration of the *Ludi Compitalicii* on January 1, 58³¹. He was clearly under the influence of Clodius and other demagogues in giving his consent to this violation of the law. One of the first things done by Clodius after his assumption of the tribuneship on December 10, 58, was to legalize the existence of clubs, by carrying a measure recognizing those already formed, and permitting the formation of many new ones. Indeed he seems to have participated actively in creating them, and especially the *collegia compitalicia*, or neighborhood clubs³². Asconius tells us that immediately there arose much greater political activity among the lowest classes³³. The *sodalicia* became more numerous than ever before, and were a serious menace to the orderly conduct of public business³⁴. It is a curious fact that nothing further is said of the *sodalicia* during the next two years. It is scarcely possible that they were inactive, but they may have been particularly on guard against the crisis which everybody foresaw must soon come. The later references to them all relate to their activity during the year of the tribuneship of Clodius. Nevertheless they were probably active as usual in these years, but by accident we do not happen to hear of them. This alone will explain the fact that the

Senate found it necessary in 56 to pass a resolution restrictive in its nature. Clodius had permitted the existence of all *collegia*; the Senate prohibited those whose members were enrolled into *decuries*, that is to say, the Senate took the point of view that these unions were a menace in proportion to their degree of organization. Cicero complains that Clodius enrolled slaves into *sodalitates*³⁵; that was probably forbidden by the decree of the Senate, or at least unions must have been prohibited which were composed of a mixture of slaves and freemen.

(To be continued)

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

R. W. HUSBAND.

REVIEWS

Introduction to Latin. By John Copeland Kirtland and George Benjamin Rogers. New York: The Macmillan Company (1914). Pp. xvi + 261. \$.85.

This book, like nearly all contemporaneous beginners' books, is a modification of the old 'grammatical method', first, in that the amount of grammatical material to be learned is greatly reduced, and, secondly, in the way in which this material is administered, namely, in small 'doses' and with graded exercises in reading and writing Latin as an accompaniment of each dose. The authors are more radical in their treatment of syntax, which is taught not by rules, but only in the form of explanations *following* the Latin-English exercises, because the authors believe that "syntax can be firmly grasped only through reading". However, Rules of Syntax are given in the back of the book for those who wish them.

One might expect that the same order would be followed in presenting the facts of grammar, and for the same reason. On the contrary paradigms are given for the most part only in the *Conspectus of Inflections* at the back of the book, because the authors believe that a presentation in detached groups "separates forms that properly go together, and make less effective use of the principle of association". Their practice, therefore, is to refer the pupil to this *Conspectus* for any set of forms which are to be learned and used in a given lesson. Some slight modification of this plan, however, evidently seemed necessary, for in the first lesson there is given the present indicative active of *amo* with English meaning, which, with eight verbs of the same conjugation given in the lesson vocabulary, the pupils are asked to learn to inflect, before they come to the Latin exercises consisting of isolated verb forms and a few unconnected sentences. In this and the next lesson no declensions are given and only the nominatives (singular and plural) of several first declension nouns are used. The first declension model *sagitta*, with meanings, is given in complete form in Lesson III. The *use* of the genitive is first found in Lesson VI, that of the dative in VII. Again, the

³¹Cicero, In Pis. 8. ³²Dio Cassius, 38.13.

³³Asconius in Pison, 8.

³⁴Cicero, Sest. 34, 55; De Domo 13, 54; Pis. 11, 23; Post Red. in Sen. 33.

³⁵Post Red. in Sen. 33: *servos simulatione collegiorum nominatim esse conscriptos*.

present indicative passive of *amo* is given in Lesson IV and the complete declension of *murus* and *bellum* is given in Lesson VIII.

I have written thus in detail about these first lessons, because the first distinguishing feature of any one of the many beginners' books of this piece-meal grammar-translation type is the *size* of the pieces and the *order* in which the author has chosen to present them. Between the old-fashioned 'grammar-first' method and the older-fashioned and new-fashioned 'reading-or-speaking-first' method lie endless possibilities; hence, the almost endless number of text-books for beginners, some of them good, some of them better, each with special devices which its author has found helpful, but all of them after all very much alike.

Like other books of this type, the vocabulary of some seven hundred words is made up largely of the words occurring most frequently in Caesar. Like many other books, this work contains, beginning at Lesson XVIII, several passages of narrative Latin, taken or adapted from Eutropius, Nepos's Hannibal, or Caesar's Helvetian War. Like some few others, it gives English derivatives in the vocabularies.

There are some things commonly contained in books of this sort which have been intentionally omitted. One of these is a summary review of English grammar. There are no *colloquia* or other signs of a leaning toward the Direct Method. The authors even say in so many words that the inflections and the vocabulary of each lesson should be assigned first, and that the reading and the writing should be taken up later.

The authors are to be commended for adopting the terminology recommended by the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, and approved by the National Education Association. However, they keep the traditional order of cases in the paradigms.

The usual subjunctive uses are included, beginning with the clause of purpose (XXXVII). The use of the infinitive in indirect statements is taken up rather late in the book (LIV), after the treatment of the subjunctive in indirect questions (XLVII). The uses of the cases are very fully given, except for the genitive, of which only one use is named (description), on the theory that the translation of the form generally tells all that the student needs to know at this early stage.

The material of the book is divided into seventy-two Lessons. The illustrations are good, many of them being full-page reproductions of portrait busts. It goes without saying that the mechanical features of the book are all that could be desired.

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

W. L. CARR.

Studies in Ennius. By Eleanor Shipley Duckett. Bryn Mawr Dissertation. (1915).

Dr. Duckett has conducted her examination after the most approved methods, and, while the unimaginative realist will be unable to accept her conclusions

as beyond question, he will find few flaws in her reasoning and must perforce admit the probability of her contentions. As a dissertation for the degree of Ph.D. it has the merit of being of reasonable compass, while calling at the same time for the mastery of a goodly amount of literature and a due proportion of independent thinking.

The monograph consists of two chapters of unequal length. The first and longer raises the question of The Place of Ennius among Writers of History. The discussion of this question involves a study of the previous annalists and a comparison of their methods with those of Ennius, with due allowance for the effects of a change from prose to poetry. The influence of Homer upon Ennius is also examined and that of Ennius himself upon the later writers of history.

The very scanty remains of the Roman *fabulae praeextae* are subjected to a thorough and ingenious scrutiny, to determine whether the legends of early Rome may be traced to that source, as some have assumed. The conclusion is that there is no evidence for such a connection in the case of Naevius, Ennius, and Pacuvius, although the Brutus and the Decius of Accius may have had some influence upon historical narrative. The existence of other *praeextae* than those to which we have direct testimony has not been proved.

The methods of the early Roman annalists are then examined, with especial attention to the question of their accuracy. Fabius and his immediate successors are shown not to have imitated the Greek novelistic historians whose methods appealed to the later and less critical generation of annalistic writers. A detailed study of the *Annales* of Ennius shows that he recounted the legends of the regal period in full, but merely as legends; that for the semi-historical period of the early Republic he emulated the brevity and the exactness of the *Annales* Maximi, rejecting hearsay and family legends; and that his account of the historical period was full and accurate. He was influenced by Homer merely in the form of his work, not in its content. As a result of his gift for character drawing and vivid narration he doubtless stamped his individuality upon many descriptions of persons and events. His influence upon the writers of the first century was "unobtrusive but pervading"; which is good.

In the second chapter the question taken up is that of the part played by the Roman chorus in speech or song within the action of the drama. The theory of Professor Capps, that "the external characteristics of the Greek tragic chorus, and, to a certain extent, its inner relations to the drama, remained unimpaired from the fifth century down to the first" is shown to be preferable to the contrary view of Leo. Dr. Duckett finds in this feature of the tragedies of Ennius a reaction from the Hellenistic tradition, which was carried forward by Pacuvius and Accius and restored the chorus to its former position of importance, although the Romans did not attempt to imitate the intricate metrical composition of the Greek choral lyric.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JOHN C. ROLFE.